IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.1799 OF 2006

Vasundhara Ashok Talware ...Petitioner.
Versus
University of Mumbai ...Respondent.

....

Mr.A.L.Gore i/b. C.J.Abhyankar, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr.R.A.Rodrigues, Advocate for the Respondent.

....

CORAM : **F.I.REBELLO AND SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,JJ.**

DATED : **AUGUST 11, 2006.**

P.C.:

1. It is the case of the petitioner that she had applied for revaluation and till date she has not heard anything in that matter. Notice was issued to the University. On behalf of the University, the learned Counsel produces the communication dated 23rd June, 2006 addressed to the petitioner, wherein it is pointed out that the Committee for Redressal of Grievances did not think it to be a fit and appropriate case, to refer the answer book for revaluation.

2. According to the petitioner she has done extremely well and this statement is being made on the basis of the Xerox copy of the answer paper, which she has received.

3. From the Rules framed by the University, there are two steps for revaluation, i.e. on application being made for revaluation, the matter goes to Redressal Committee which is a high level committee consisting of Dean of the faculty concerned, Chairman of the relevant Board of Studies, and one subject expert teacher. If the redressal committee recommends revaluation, then only is the papers sent for the revaluation. In this case, the high power committee did not feel it to be a fit case for sending papers for revaluation. In these circumstances, it will not be possible for us to grant any relief to the petitioner.

4. The petitioner states that she be allowed to make a fresh application. We have nothing to say. If according to law, it is permissible to so apply, the petitioner to take steps according to law.

5. With the above observation, Petition stands disposed of.

[F.I.REBELLO,J.]

[SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.]